

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

IAN A. WOODS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AARON BROWN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

2:13-cv-01029-APG-NJK

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION

(Docket No. 27)

An inmate has no constitutional right to free photocopying. *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517, 521 (9th Cir. 1991). Pursuant to NDOC regulations, inmates can only accrue a maximum of \$100 debt for copy work expenses for all cases. *See, e.g., Weddle v. Baker*, 2014 U.S. Dist. Lexis 151674, *3 (D. Nev. Oct. 27, 2014). “In this district, courts have found that they can order a prison to extend limited photocopying when it is necessary for an inmate to provide copies to the Court and other parties.” *Id.* (citing *Allen v. Clark Cnty. Det. Ctr.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 31756 (D. Nev. Mar. 11, 2011)).

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to extend his copy work limit. Docket No. 27. Defendants filed an opposition to the motion that “recognize[s] that Plaintiff may require an extended line of credit to prosecute this case.” Docket No. 30 at 3. Nonetheless, Defendants seek to deny the motion in its current form by arguing that Plaintiff has insufficiently accounted for the money previously allotted to him and that the Court should require him to present a written budget for moving forward.

1 *See id.* at 3-4. In reply, Plaintiff identified documents for which he seeks copies, including documents
2 and Court filings that Plaintiff seeks to submit to the Court to supplement the pleadings. *See* Docket No.
3 35 at 2-3.

4 Based on the showing in the pending motion, the Court will **GRANT** the motion in part. In
5 particular, the Court will provide Plaintiff with an increase to his prison copy work limit so that he is
6 allotted an additional \$20.00 worth of copying privileges. The Court advises Plaintiff, however, that he
7 should use his copying privileges sparingly, refrain from filing numerous, unnecessary and duplicative
8 motions, and attempt to duplicate documents through other means (including handwriting copies)
9 because further requests for an increase in Plaintiff's photocopy allowance will not be looked upon
10 favorably. To the extent any further requests are made, Plaintiff shall specifically identify how he has
11 spent the money allotted so far, and shall explain in more detail his expected future copying
12 requirements.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: November 18, 2014

15
16 
17 _____
18 NANCY J. KOPPE
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26